UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,212	03/10/2004	Evan H. Zucker	9495-003	6145
⁷⁹⁶⁸¹ David A. Einho	7590 09/03/200 orn, Esa.	EXAMINER		
Baker & Hostetler LLP			VEZERIS, JAMES A	
	45 Rockefeller Plaza New York, NY 10111		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/798,212	ZUCKER, EVAN H.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES A. VEZERIS	3693	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLAY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to divide apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20.2 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Th 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, p		
Disposition of Claims			
4)	awn from consideration.	equirement.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examir	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ction is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure: * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date	

Application/Control Number: 10/798,212 Page 2

Art Unit: 3693

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-7, 14-19, 20-26, 33-39, 40-42, and 64-67, drawn to performing a tax-deferred transaction involving an investor owning a relinquished property by exchanging said property for a replacement, transferring said replacement property to an operating partnership comprising operating units, and receiving operating units in exchange for the replacement property, classified in class 705, subclass 36T.
 - II. Claim 68, drawn to facilitating a tax-deferred transaction involving an investor or investor partnership, calculating lease payment information entering in an agreement to receive a first interest in said investor partnership, classified in class 705, subclass 36T.
- 2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-7, 14-19, 20-26, 33-39, 40-42, and 64-67, in the reply filed on 4/20/2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a) The office has not established that the inventions identified are either independent or distinct, and b) The examiner has not established that the search and examination of all the claims in the current application cannot be made without serious burden. This is not found persuasive because as shown in the restriction requirement the requirements of each grouping are different resulting in patentable distinctions.

Art Unit: 3693

Further even though claims can be classified in the same class and subclass it does not allow.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

- 3. Claims 1-7, 14-19, 20-26, 33-39, 40-42, and 64-68 are currently pending.
- 4. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it focuses on transferring a replacement property for partnership units, not on interest in investor partnerships. The subcombination has separate utility such as calculating lease payment information, transferring in exchange for partnership interest.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Application/Control Number: 10/798,212 Page 4

Art Unit: 3693

5. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election

shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES A. VEZERIS whose telephone number is (571)270-1580. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-alt. Fridays 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/798,212 Page 6

Art Unit: 3693

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James A. Kramer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693

/JAMES A VEZERIS/ Examiner, Art Unit 3693

8/31/2009